

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 9 remain in the application and have been amended hereby.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 1 and 9 under 35 USC 102 (b), as being anticipated by Sombroek et al.

Features of the present invention are a processor (9 in Fig. 1) for receiving command signals from first and second command means, for judging similarity when one of the first and second command means is activated following another of the first and second command means, and for continuing a predetermined speed of increase when a similarity is found and for returning to an initial speed when the similarity is not found.

An example of finding similarity would be when "channel up" is activated following "channel down" and an example of not finding similarity would be when "channel up" is activated following "volume up".

Claims 1 and 9 have been amended to emphasize these features of the present invention.

Looking at Sombroek et al. we see that the user interface shown in Fig. 4 includes four force sensing resistors (402, 404, 406, and 408) connected to control voltages, e.g. 5V, at respective four nodes (414, 416, 418, and 420) and a converter (304) including a capacitor (410) connected to each of the sensing resistor via the same node (412). The output of the

converter is fed to a processor (306).

It is respectfully submitted that Sombroek et al. is silent about judging similarity of actions of two command means because the processor (306) of Sombroek et al. is being fed by a converter (304) that can not distinguish which sensing resistor (402, 404, 406, or 408) is being pressed. That is, the processor (306) is only informed of the fact that one of the sensing resistors is being pressed but is not capable of distinguishing which one.

Further, the look-up table (438) cited in the Office Action merely serves to store a speed value which is unrelated to the recited judgment of similarity of actions of two command means. See col. 7, lines 21-22 of Sombroek et al. ("translated by a calculation means 438 of processor 306 into a quantity associated with a magnitude of the speed. . .").

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that amended claims 1 and 9 are not anticipated by Sombroek et al.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,  
COOPER & DUNHAM LLP



Jay M. Maioli  
Reg. No. 27,213

JHM/PCF:tb